

MINUTES OF TTF CG MEETING

To: Distribution

From: Bob Hunnicutt, Tower Coordinator, Columbia Telecommunications

A meeting of the Telecommunications Transmission Facility Coordinating Group (TTF CG) was held on July 3, 2002. The following people were in attendance:

MEMBERS

Jane Lawton OCA (240) 777-3724

Michael Ma M-NCPPC (301) 495-4595

Pat Hanehan MCPS (301) 279-3609

Helen Xu DIST (240) 777-2804

Eric Carzon OMB (240) 777-2763

STAFF

Margie Williams OCA (240) 777-3762

Robert Hunnicutt CTC (410) 964-5700

Kamal Johari CTC (410) 964-5700

OTHER ATTENDEES

Steve Weber VoiceStream Wireless

Carolyn Mitchell Cingular Wireless (410) 712-7754

Bill O'Brien VoiceStream Wireless (240) 264-8617

Hassan Khalil Sprint PCS

Sean Hughes Nextel Communications (410) 953-7439

David Primeau Sprint PCS (301) 564-1827

Alan Swendiman Jackson & Campbell (202) 457-1646

Action Item: Approval of June 12, 2002 minutes: Pat Hanehan had a correction on page 8, and requested that the words "to the first carrier" be inserted after the word "rent" on the next to the last line. He stated that change would more clearly reflect the intent of what he said. Steve Weber had a correction on page 3, noting that it was Crown Castle that had already obtained an administrative modification to the Special Exception, not VoiceStream. Pat Hanehan moved the minutes be approved as amended. Eric Carzon seconded the motion and the minutes were unanimously approved.

Action: Consent Agenda Item:

2. VoiceStream Wireless application to attach six antennas at the 120' level of the 150' monopole on the Pyle property located at 211 Ednor Road in Silver Spring (Application #200206-03).

3. Cingular Wireless application to attach antennas at the 97' level of an existing 120' monopole on the Baptist Home property located at 6301 Greentree Road in Bethesda (Application #200206-04).

Jane Lawton asked that item 1 be removed from the consent agenda so it may be discussed.

Motion: Eric Carzon moved that item 2 be recommended, and that item 3 be recommended conditioned on modification to the Special Exception as may be necessary to accommodate additional ground space for the equipment. Pat Hanehan seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Action Item:

1. VoiceStream Wireless application to replace four 54" antennas with four 72" antennas, and add two additional 72" antennas at the 172' level of an existing Westlake Towers building located at 7420 Westlake Terrace in Bethesda (Application #200206-02).

Jane Lawton asked why this item was on the consent agenda since it had two antennas being added to the location in addition to the replacement antennas. Bob Hunnicutt explained that past consent agenda VoiceStream applications for changing out antennas had also included placement of one or two antennas, and he thought that was consistent with the TTFCG's direction for consent agenda items. Bill O'Brien stated that the applications which contained provisions for the addition of one antenna to an existing site, had been approved as part of the consent agenda, and he did not think it had been a problem.

Motion: Eric Carzon moved that item 1 be recommended. Helen Xu seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Action Item: Sprint PCS application to construct a new 150' monopole on the Lloyd property located at 21410 Beallsville Road in Dickerson (Application #200205-02).

Kamal Johari summarized the application. He noted that the Tower Coordinator had asked Sprint to consider use of an existing PEPCO transmission line tower to the west of the proposed site, or replacement of an existing County tower to the east of the proposed site. He stated that Sprint had provided RF maps which showed that neither of those alternatives would provide the desired coverage levels for Sprint in this area.

Jane Lawton asked if a 120' monopole could be used instead of a 150' monopole. Mr. Johari explained that the Tower Coordinator had asked for RF maps using a shorter monopole. He said Sprint had submitted RF maps for antennas at 120' which indicated that the shorter height did not completely cover the service area desired by Sprint. He noted it left some small gaps in service to the north and the northwest.

Jane Lawton asked if a shorter monopole used in conjunction with antennas on the PEPCO transmission line tower could meet the coverage requirements. Mr. Johari stated that although he had not conducted an analysis of that alternative, based on the information he did review, he thought there would probably still be coverage gaps to the north and northwest. He stated that, based on his review of the RF maps at the 120' level, an even shorter monopole would most likely result in greater coverage gaps to the east.

Bob Hunnicutt added that in considering a shorter monopole in order to minimize the visual impact on the community, he believed that whether the monopole was 120' or 150', it would still be plainly visible from homes to the south of the site because the monopole would still be above the tree level and would be quite noticeable. He added that he thought the monopole would also be very visible from Barnesville residents whose back yards face south/west from Barnesville Road toward this site, such as the Mayor's house. In response to questions, he explained that the views from the northern direction to the site would be somewhat concealed by the heavily wooded areas on that side of the ridge above Beallsville Road.

Sprint representative, Alan Swendiman, displayed a large aerial photo of the site, showing the heavily wooded areas to the north. Jane Lawton asked how far the PEPCO transmission tower was from the site. Bob Hunnicutt replied that it was approximately one mile to the west. At the group's request, the Sprint RF engineer displayed the RF maps, and explained how the computer model had been used to predict coverage at 190', 150', and 120'. He noted that Sprint had originally considered a 190' monopole, but had later reduced it to 150' to minimize its impact on the community. He stated that it was beneficial to Sprint to attain lower elevations where possible because of the lower cost of the shorter monopole. He added that lower monopoles were in the community's interest as well. In response to questions, he agreed that based on the RF maps, that there did not appear to be much coverage difference between the 120' and the 150' levels, but noted that the heavily wooded areas to the north would also have an effect on reducing the coverage from a lower monopole as well. He noted that the RF maps are simple predictions of the coverage, and do not fully account for considerations such as heavily wooded areas.

Jane Lawton asked to see the RF map which showed the existing coverage. In reviewing the map, she asked about site #680. Hassan Khalil stated he believed that site had not yet been constructed. Bob Hunnicutt stated that it appeared to him that site #680 was the Dickerson Auto Center location, where a monopole had been constructed, although Sprint was not currently attached to it. Sprint stated that sites on the map included both proposed and active sites, but the Dickerson site had not yet been constructed by Sprint. Bob Hunnicutt explained that typically, RF maps showing existing coverage includes sites which may be active as well as sites which may be proposed as part of the carrier's plan, but not yet constructed and activated. He said that during the Tower Coordinator's review, they look at all of the sites on the RF maps submitted with the

application, and compare them to the tower database and the carrier's annual plan. He also noted that if there is other information available, it is reviewed as well. In this case, there was one site which was on a set of RF maps for another proposed Sprint site to the east of I-270 that was not shown on these RF maps. As part of that review, he had questioned Sprint about that missing site and was told that facility was no longer part of Sprint's plan. He said he requested that Sprint amend its plan and provide information about any other sites which may have changed for this vicinity, which Sprint did. He said that in reviewing this application, the Tower Coordinator examined the RF maps with and without the proposed site; questioned the use of alternative structures in the general vicinity; and compared the information provided by Sprint with information in the database or associated with other applications.

Eric Carzon asked if it was possible to have a monopole disguised as a flagpole at this location. Jane Lawton added that if the monopole were shorter, a "tree" monopole would fit in better with the existing trees along the ridgeline. Sprint's engineers stated they believed they had already addressed the issue of a shorter monopole. He noted that the flagpole disguise was limited in the number of antennas it can accommodate, and consequently, was a less attractive site for co-location - an objective both Sprint and the County was interested in pursuing. Kamal Johari explained that the flagpole design limited the number of antennas that could be attached to the monopole to three antennas for each of three separate carriers on the pole. He agreed that would result in diminished capacity for a monopole designed in a flagpole configuration.

Michael Ma asked if it was possible to relocate the monopole to another location on the Lloyd property, and asked how large the site was. David Primeau said the site was 25 acres, but that the northern side of the property had lower elevations which would hamper the coverage. He displayed the detailed site plan which showed the elevation levels. Bob Hunnicutt stated that in reviewing other applications, when similar questions had been asked, it had been explained that moving the monopole a few hundred feet in any direction should not have a significant impact on the coverage as long as the ground elevations remained fairly constant for the site. He noted that in this case, the elevations did go downhill away from the proposed monopole site and that may have some adverse impact on meeting the coverage requirements. He stated that the Tower Coordinator's engineer could not determine the impact in any greater detail unless they were provided additional RF maps from Sprint showing coverage from different locations on the property. Sprint's engineer agreed, and stated that if the monopole was moved to a lower ground elevation it would have to be taller than 150' in order to maintain the same antenna height.

Eric Carzon suggested that the group highlight in its recommendation that they had discussed a number of alternatives for this site, including a shorter monopole, a stealth design, and moving the monopole to a different location on the property. He said he believed that the 150' monopole appeared to provide the best solution to meet the coverage requirements. He suggested noting in the Record of Action that there may be some stealth options available to help minimize the intrusion of this facility on the community, and perhaps avoid the potential for controversy over this siting.

Jane Lawton said she agreed with the Tower Coordinator's recommendation based on obtaining approval from the Historical Trust for this site. She asked if the proposal to place this monopole had been reviewed with the Barnesville residents. Alan Swendiman replied that, to the best of his knowledge, that had not been done, but assured the group that it would be done in the future. He stated that with regard to the Historical Trust approval, Sprint had already received approval from the Maryland Historical Trust, and that it had been provided to the Tower Coordinator with the application. Mr. Hunnicutt said that the document was illegible except for a signature, so he was unable to verify that approval. Mr. Swendiman stated he would provide a copy of the Maryland Historical Trust letter for his review. He added that Sprint already had approval from the Park and Planning Commission regarding forest conservation.

David Primeau stated that a monopole shorter than 150' at this site would require another monopole to the north and east of this location to fill in gaps created by the reduced height of this monopole.

Pat Hanehan asked the Tower Coordinator if his review of the annual plans showed any other carriers planning to locate in the general vicinity of this monopole. Bob Hunnicutt replied the plans had not identified any other carriers planning to locate in this area. He said he believed other carriers would be interested in co-locating on this facility, however, because there are no other tall structures in the area. Eric Carzon said his suggestion for noting in the Record of Action that the height of the monopole had been thoroughly reviewed and discussed by the TTCG would give other interested parties not in attendance confidence that this matter had been

thoroughly discussed.

Jane Lawton stated that it is specifically this type of siting that rural residents object to - a tall monopole near an historical district and in an agricultural preservation zone. She stated that she was disappointed that Sprint had not done more outreach in the surrounding community to advise the residents of this proposal. She added that she wanted the minutes to reflect that the TTFCG asked Sprint to meet with the Town of Barnesville representatives and to review Sprint's proposed siting with other interested parties.

Sean Hughes asked how public input could impact a technical review, which was the primary focus of the TTFCG's activity. Ms. Lawton stated that there were requirements for the TTFCG to consider input from the public and the impact on the community. She stated that this was just the sort of case that has prompted the proposed changes in the zoning text which are presently pending before the Council. She said that the TTFCG had supported the carriers in their desire to change the proposed tower height limit from 155' to 199', but added that if carriers do not believe that a lower structure is preferred, or if the carriers do not respond to making the towers as low as possible, perhaps the TTFCG should change its position. She stated that residents in these areas have been complaining to their elected officials that they do not want these tall structures erected in their community. She stated that the County is a public agency and needs to be sensitive to those issues and respond to them accordingly. Mr. Hughes stated that he objects to the TTFCG considering the impact on the community.

Ms. Lawton stated that she agreed with Eric Carzon that there is an opportunity to make this a stealth siting but did not agree that there were perhaps different options for a lower facility on this property. She said she based this on today's discussion of different height options for the monopole at this location. Eric Carzon agreed, and stated he believed the 150' height would be necessary for coverage as well as co-location.

Jane Lawton suggested the group recommend the application based on the Tower Coordinator's recommended conditions, and make a note that this may be a possible stealth siting.

Motion: Eric Carzon moved the application be recommended based on approval from the Historical Trust and approval of a Special Exception. Michael Ma seconded the motion and it was approved with Helen Xu voting against the motion. Pat Hanehan asked Ms. Xu why she opposed the recommendation. Ms. Xu stated she believed it was very important for the residents to know of this facility before the TTFCG recommends it.

Action Item: Sprint PCS application to construct a new 155' monopole on Tewksbury Manor property located at 5600 Sundown Road in Gaithersburg (Application #200206-01).

Kamal Johari summarized the application. He noted that this site was in lieu of a previous application to attach to a FEMA tower in the same area. He stated that FEMA had withdrawn its approval for Sprint to attach to its existing lattice tower because of security concerns since the September 11 attacks. Bob Hunnicutt reminded the group that Nextel had originally proposed a new monopole at the Ace Nursery before the Tower Coordinator and Jane Lawton worked with FEMA to reconsider use of its tower as a site for private carriers to co-locate. He had spoken with FEMA representatives, and FEMA had agreed to let carriers attach to its facility in lieu of constructing a new monopole in the community. He added that since the September attacks, this facility has very tight security and will not permit outside parties to use its facilities.

Jane Lawton asked how far the proposed monopole was from the nearby residence. David Primeau stated he thought it was approximately 400 feet. Bob Hunnicutt referred the group to the site plan in their packet, noting that there was a setback of approximately 700' from the rear lot line, and it appeared as though the residence was halfway between the monopole and the rear lot line, so it appeared that 400' was a reasonable estimate of that distance.

Eric Carzon asked if RF maps had been submitted by the carrier and reviewed by the Tower Coordinator. Bob Hunnicutt stated that RF maps had been submitted and reviewed, and that the maps illustrated a gap in coverage that this site appeared to fill. Eric Carzon noted that there did not appear to be any community outreach on this application, either.

Jane Lawton commented that she liked the stealth approach for this siting, although a flagpole of this great height and size was out of character with the area. Michael Ma asked how far this monopole was from the Laytonsville community. Bob Hunnicutt stated it was approximately 1.6 miles.

Motion: Eric Carzon moved the application be recommended conditioned on approval of a Special Exception. Pat Hanehan seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Action Item: Sprint PCS application to construct a new 120' monopole at the Goshen United Methodist Church property located at 7700 Brink Road in Gaithersburg (Application #200206-06).

Kamal Johari summarized the application. He noted that this monopole would be quite visible from many of the surrounding houses and the adjacent park property. He stated that RF maps had been submitted and reviewed by the Tower Coordinator.

Jane Lawton stated that she thought it was important for the Tower Coordinator to note in future recommendation comments that a search of the TTF CG database and the carriers' annual plans if performed to identify any existing structures for co-location opportunities. Bob Hunnicutt agreed. He noted that the latitude and longitude of the confidential database is compared with the latitude and longitude of the application, and the distances are calculated to determine if there are existing structures that may be considered for co-location. He noted that this information, as well as the site visit, allows the Tower Coordinator to determine if there are existing structures available for co-location in lieu of new construction. He noted that this is an integral part of the review of each new facility.

Motion: Helen Xu moved the application be recommended conditioned on approval of a Special Exception. Eric Carzon seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Discussion Item - Legislative Update: Jane Lawton noted that the PHED committee would be reviewing the zoning text amendment on July 18 at 9:00 a.m. She wanted to notify the carriers of this meeting so those wishing to attend may do so. She noted there were a number of proposals in the legislation which would be important for the carriers to know. She added that the Park and Planning Commission was still in the process of submitting its comments to the PHED committee for review at that meeting. She stated the code changes regarding fees had already been through the MFP committee and they were waiting for the Executive's recommendation of the fee amounts before being sent to the Council for its review.

Ms. Lawton summarized the fee structure and distributed a draft of proposed changes. Pat Hanehan asked why the co-location fees were so high. Ms. Lawton replied that the County wanted to recover the full cost of processing the applications, and in order to do so, either the fees for Special Exceptions and Mandatory Referrals would have to be very high, or the fees for co-location applications (the majority of applications) would have to be somewhat higher to compensate for lower Special Exception and Mandatory Referral fees. She stated that the carriers had objected to the amount of both fees, but the fee had been set to cover the County's costs. She noted that the higher co-location fees offset lower fees for new towers. Eric Carzon added that the Council wanted to recover the complete costs to the County. He said these costs not only included the Tower Coordinator costs, but also the County and participating agencies' staff time as well. He added that he believed the reference to access to the GIS data should not be part of the annual fee, but noted that Marilyn Praisner believed the carriers should pay whatever fee is appropriate to obtain GIS information.

Bob Hunnicutt asked who was required to pay the annual fee, noting that some of the applications submitted for review were from organizations intending to locate antennas at only one or two sites in the County, and so would not necessarily have an annual plan. After discussion, the group decided it was appropriate to leave the annual fee applicable to everyone with antennas in the County, as it would be difficult to determine who would be submitting more than one application or who needed to submit an annual plan.

After discussion, the terms referring to "simple change" and "systematic change" were revised to "minor modification" and "multiple modifications", respectively. Eric Carzon added that for the multiple modifications, the second example should reflect the same language as first one with regard to "no change inside the structure or ground space".

The next meeting of the TTF CG is scheduled for Wednesday, July 31, 2002 at 2:00 p.m. in the 2nd floor conference room #225 of the COB.